



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/573,861 | 03/27/2006 | Takamitsu Saito | 1085-013USD1 | 7030 |
| 22919 7590 06/15/2009 GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP 1233 20TH STREET, NW, SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036-2680 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| TALBOT, BRIAN K | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 1792 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 06/15/2009 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/573,861

Applicant(s)

SAITO ET AL.

Examiner

Brian K. Talbot

Art Unit

1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 March 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/27/06
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

1. Claims 1-23 remain in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7,8,17,18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 7,8,17,18 and 19, the phrase "type" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "type"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,2,7,17,20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Drengler et al. (3,087,003).

Drengler et al. (3,087,003) teaches a primary battery whereby anode or cathode powders are placed in a mold, a shim support, i.e. collector, is placed on top and a mold pressed to form the coating on the shim support. Next another shim support is welded to the first shim support and a second anode or cathode powder is applied thereto and mold pressed to form the cathode/anode on either side of the shim support. The pressure of molding is higher in the first pressing step than in the second (col. 2, lines 24-47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 3-6 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drengler et al. (3,087,003).

Drengler et al. (3,087,003) fails to teach or fairly suggest the claims porosity and the claimed pressure of compressing the material.

While the Examiner acknowledges the fact that Drengler et al. (3,087,003) is silent with respect to the compression amount and porosity formed after compression, it is the Examiner's position that these are "result effective" variables which are deemed as obvious modification of the prior art absent a showing of unexpected results. It is noted that the first compression step is greater than the second compression step and this is taught by Drengler et al. (3,087,003).

8. Claims 9-12, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drengler et al. (3,087,003) in combination with Zhang (2003/0175588).

Drengler et al. (3,087,003) fails to teach or fairly suggest adding a binder and a conductive enhancement and the particular cathode material.

Zhang (2003/0175588) teaches a cathode paste material including a cathode material, a binder of PVF and carbon black or acetylene black as a conductive enhancer. The cathode material can be lithium cobalt dioxide as well as others (abstract and [0022] – [0024]).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drengler et al. (3,087,003) cathode/anode paste to include a binder, conductive material and the particular cathode material as evidenced by Zhang (2003/0175588) with the expectation of achieving a successful paste for producing electrodes.

9. Claims 8 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drengler et al. (3,087,003) in combination with Varma (4,687,598).

Drengler et al. (3,087,003) fails to teach or fairly suggest adding a solid electrolyte and electrolyte supporting salt.

Varma (4,687,598) teaches a an electrode active material for batteries which includes active material, binder and a electrically conductive polymer (abstract). The electrically conductive polymer includes polyethylene oxide and the anode active material is a lithium such as LiCFSO (col. 2, lines 4-40).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drengler et al. (3,087,003) cathode/anode paste to include a solid electrolyte and electrolyte supporting salt as evidenced by Varma (4,687,598) with the expectation of achieving a successful paste for producing electrodes.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K. Talbot whose telephone number is (571) 272-1428. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy H. Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian K Talbot/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792

BKT